

Appl. No. 10/676,312  
Amdt. dated January 29, 2007  
Reply to Office action of December 13, 2006

**REMARKS**

This paper responds to the office action dated December 13, 2006.

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirement, the applicant elects species 6, represented in part by FIG. 16. The claims that read on the elected species are claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-17, 30, 31, 33-35, 64-66, 88, 89, 92-101, 104, 105, 108, and 109.

The applicant also notes that FIG 17, which depicts nothing more than a Viterbi algorithm, is not properly considered a species of the claimed invention, since the applicant did not invent the Viterbi algorithm depicted. Instead, FIG. 17 merely depicts a part of the embodiment of elected claim 16. *See, e.g.* Specification at p. 28 line 20 to p. 32 line 15 (describing the embodiment depicted in FIG. 16).

In view of the foregoing election, the applicant respectfully requests examination and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-17, 30, 31, 33-35, 64-66, 88, 89, 92-101, 104, 105, 108, and 109.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlfs  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631